REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicants amended claims 9, 18, and 27 to clarify the antecedent basis of the "administrator" element.

Applicants amended claims 7, 16, and 25 to remove an erroneous placement of a period.

The Examiner objected to the claims on the grounds that claim 3 is missing. (Office Action, p. 2). In the above listing of the claims, Applicants show claim 3 as canceled to overcome this objection.

The Examiner objected to the drawings for not showing the reference numbers 10a, 10b, 10c. (Office Action, pg. 2) Applicants amended the Specification to change "10a, 10b, 10c" to "10" to overcome this rejection.

1.   <u>Claims 1, 2, 11, 12, 20, and 21 are Directed to Statutory Subject Matter</u>

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 2, 11, 12, 20, and 21 as directed to non-statutory subject matter (35 U.S.C. §101) on the grounds the claims to not produce a useful result and the claims could apply to someone distributing candies.

To overcome this rejection, Applicants amended independent claims 1, 11, and 20 to require that the permitted resource allocation indicates computational resources that may be allocated to user computational requests and that the permitted resource allocation is used to allocate resources to user computational requests. Applicants further amended these claims to recite that the modification restriction limitation is for modifications that may be made to computational resources indicated in the permitted resource allocation. These added requirements are disclosed on pgs. 4-6 and FIGs. 2 and 3 of the Specification.

This amendment adds useful and tangible results to the claim requirements concerning allocating computational resources to computational requests.

Applicants submit that these amendments overcome this rejection and the rejection should be withdrawn.

2.   <u>Claims 1-28 are Patentable Over the Cited Art</u>

The Examiner rejected claims 1-28 as anticipated by Sprigg (Int'l Pub. No. WO 03/021467). Applicants traverse for the following reasons.

Amended claims 1, 11, and 20 require receiving a request to modify a permitted resource allocation indicating computational resources that may be allocated to user computational requests; determining a modification restriction providing a limit on modifications that may be made to the computational resources indicated in permitted resource allocation; and allowing the requested modification to the permitted resource allocation if the determined modification restriction allows the requested modification; and using the permitted resource allocation to allocate resources to user computational requests.

The Examiner cited paras. [0004] and [0012] of Sprigg as disclosing the receiving the request limitation, which now recites receiving a request to modify a permitted resource allocation indicating computational resources that may be allocated to user computational requests.   (Office Action, pg. 4)

The cited para. [0004] mentions that applications during execution require various resources on the device they are executing, including memory, CPU time, I/O ports, etc. If the device is connected to a network the application may also want to access device resources to use the network. The cited para. [0012] mentions allowing access to a device resource involving receiving a request for the device resource, evaluating a permission list associated with the application indicating the resources the application can access, and granting the application access to the device resource based on the indication in the permission list.

Although the cited paras. [0004] and [0012] discuss how a permission list associated with an application is used to evaluate whether an application may access one or more device resources, nowhere do the cited paras. [0004] and [0012] disclose or mention a request to modify a permitted resource allocation. In other words, nowhere do these cited paragraphs anywhere disclose processing a request to modify the permission list. Instead, the cited paragraphs concern how the permission list is used to determine whether the application may access the requested device resource.

The Examiner cited the above discussed paras. [0004] and [0012] as disclosing the claim requirement of determining the modification restriction, which now recites determining a modification restriction providing a limit on modifications that may be made to computational resources indicated in the permitted resource allocation;. (Office Action, pg. 4) Applicants traverse.

The cited paras. [0004] and [0012] discuss how a permission list is used to evaluate whether an application may access one or more device resources. This does not disclose or concern the claim requirement of determining a modification restriction limiting modifications that may be made to the computational resources indicated in the permitted resource allocation. The cited paras. [0004] and [0012] discuss how a permissions list is used to determine whether an application can access a device resource. This is different from and does not disclose the claim requirement of determining whether there is a restriction limiting how one may modify the computational resources indicated in a permitted resource allocation. For instance, the cited paragraphs do note disclose determining whether there are restrictions on modifications that may be made to computational resources indicated in the permissions list.

The Examiner cited paras. [0007] and [0048] as disclosing the claim requirement of allowing the requested modification requirement, which now recites allowing the requested modification to the permitted resource allocation if the determined modification restriction allows the requested modification. (Office Action, p. 4) Applicants traverse.

The cited para. [0007] mentions that if the user is a systems administrator, then the user may be given more access to the device and network resources. The super user's privileges remain the same across all applications the super user executes. A same application executed by a typical user may be granted additional resources if executed by a super user. The cited para. [0048] mentions that if the permission list indicates the application has the privilege to access the requested resource, the application is granted access.

The cited paras. [0007] and [0048] discuss allowing an application to access resources depending upon permissions indicated in a permission list and super user privileges. However, the claims concern allowing a requested modification to a permitted resource allocation if the modification restriction allows the modification. Nowhere does the cited Sprigg disclose or discuss allowing one to modify a permitted resource allocation if a modification restriction allows such a modification. Instead, the cited Sprigg concerns determining whether a user may access a device resource, not whether one may modify a permitted resource allocation indicating the resources that may be allocated. In other words, the cited Sprigg does not disclose or discuss determining whether modifications may be made to resources indicated in the permission list. Instead, the cited Sprigg discusses using the permissions list to determine whether device resources may be accessed.

Accordingly, claims 1, 11, and 20 are patentable over the cited Sprigg because the requirements of these claims are not disclosed in the cited art.

Claims 2, 4-10, 12-19, and 21-28 are patentable over the cited art because they depend from one of claims 1, 11, and 20, which are patentable over the cited art for the reasons discussed above. Moreover, the following discussed dependent claims provide additional grounds of patentability over the cited art.

Claims 2, 12, and 21 depend from claims 1, 11, and 20, respectively, and further recite that the determination of the modification restriction comprises determining whether there is one modification restriction for the resource allocation to be modified for a user that initiated the request or for a database to which the resource allocation applies.

The Examiner cited the above discussed paras. [0004], [0007], [0012], and [0048] as disclosing the additional requirements of these claims. (Office Action, pg. 4) Applicants traverse.

As discussed, although the cited Sprigg discusses using a permissions list to determine whether an application may access a device resource, there is no disclosure or mention in the cited Sprigg of the claim requirement of a modification restriction concerning limiting modifications that may be made to the permitted resource allocation. The cited Sprigg does not concern limits on how one may modify the cited permissions list, but instead discusses how the permissions list may be used to determine access to a device resource.

The cited para. [0031] mentions how a server database has records of identifications of application programs downloaded onto each wireless device and records for each wireless device, including the model, carrier, region where wireless device is used, and other information to identify the wireless device. The cited para. [0031] discusses how a server database has information on downloaded applications and wireless devices. Nowhere does the cited para. [0031] anywhere disclose determining whether there is a modification restriction limiting modifications that may be made to a permitted resource list, wherein the modification restriction is for a user that initiated the request or for a database to which the resource application applies. Instead, the cited para. [0031] discusses information a server database may have on wireless devices, not determining whether there is a modification restriction for a resource allocation for a user or database.

Accordingly, claims 2, 12, and 21 are patentable over the cited art because the additional requirements of these claims are not disclosed in the cited Sprigg.

Claims 4, 13, and 22 depend from claims 1, 11, and 20, respectively, and further require generating an error condition if the requested modification is not permitted by the modification restriction.

The Examiner cited the above discussed paras. [0004], [0007], [0012], [0031], and [0048] as teaching the additional requirements of these claims. (Office Action, pg. 4) Applicants traverse.

The cited paragraphs discuss a permissions list that is used to determine whether an application may access a device resource and that a server database has information on downloaded applications and wireless devices in the network. Nowhere do the cited paragraphs anywhere disclose the claim requirement of generating an error condition if a requested modification to computational resources indicated in a permitted resource allocation is not permitted by the permitted resource allocation. In other words, nowhere do the cited paragraphs anywhere disclose or mention generating an error condition if a modification to resources indicated in the cited permissions list is not permitted.

Accordingly, claims 4, 13, and 22 are patentable over the cited art because the additional requirements of these claims are not disclosed in the cited Sprigg.

Claims 5, 14, and 23 depend from claims 1, 1, and 21, respectively, and further require that the permitted resource allocation comprises an amount of memory or an amount of processor resources to use when processing the operation, and wherein the requested modification of the amount of memory or processor resources to use is permitted if the modification restriction indicates that the permitted resource allocation can be modified.

The Examiner cited the above discussed paras. [0004], [0007], [0012], [0031], and [0048] as teaching the additional requirements of these claims. (Office Action, pg. 5) Applicants traverse.

The cited paragraphs discuss a permissions list that is used to determine whether an application may access a device resource and that a server database has information on downloaded applications and wireless devices in the network. Nowhere do the cited paragraphs anywhere disclose the claim requirement of a requested modification to an amount of memory or processor resources indicated in the permitted resource allocation. In other words, nowhere do

the cited paragraphs disclose requested modifications of permitted memory or processor resources indicated in the permissions list. Instead, the cited paragraphs discuss using the permissions list to determine whether the application may access the device resources.

Accordingly, claims 5, 14, and 23 are patentable over the cited art because the additional requirements of these claims are not disclosed in the cited Sprigg.

Claims 6, 15, and 24 depend from claims 1, 11, and 21, respectively, and further require that the permitted resource allocation indicates a location where data structures may be created, and wherein the requested modification of the location where data structures may be created is permitted if the modification restriction indicates that the permitted resource allocation can be modified.

The Examiner cited the above discussed paras. [0004], [0007], [0012], [0031], and [0048] as teaching the additional requirements of these claims. (Office Action, pg. 5) Applicants traverse.

The cited paragraphs discuss a permissions list that is used to determine whether an application may access a device resource and that a server database has information on downloaded applications and wireless devices in the network. Nowhere do the cited paragraphs anywhere disclose the claim requirement of a limitation on the location where data structures may be created and a requested modification to a permitted resource allocation indicating the location where data structures may be may be created. For instance, the cited paragraphs discuss using a permissions list to determine whether device resources may be accessed. However, the Examiner has not cited any part of Sprigg that discloses that a permitted resource allocation, or the cited permissions list, indicates a location where data structures may be created.

Accordingly, claims 6, 15, and 24 are patentable over the cited art because the additional requirements of these claims are not disclosed in the cited Sprigg.

Claims 7, 16, and 25 depend from claims 1, 11, and 21, respectively, and further require that the permitted resource allocation indicates a type limitation on the type of data structures that may be created, and wherein the requested modification of the type of data structures that may be created is permitted if the modification restriction indicates that the permitted resource allocation can be modified.

The Examiner cited the above discussed paras. [0004], [0007], [0012], [0031], and [0048] as teaching the additional requirements of these claims. (Office Action, pg. 5) Applicants traverse.

The cited paragraphs discuss a permissions list that is used to determine whether an application may access a device resource and that a server database has information on downloaded applications and wireless devices in the network. Nowhere do the cited paragraphs anywhere disclose a limitation on the type of data structures that may be created and a requested modification to a permitted resource allocation of the type of data structures that may be created. For instance, the cited paragraphs discuss using a permissions list to determine whether device resources may be accessed. However, the Examiner has not cited any part of Sprigg that discloses that a permitted resource allocation, or the cited permissions list, indicates a limitation on the type of data structures that may be created.

Accordingly, claims 7, 16, and 25 are patentable over the cited art because the additional requirements of these claims are not disclosed in the cited Sprigg.

Claims 8, 17, and 26 depend from claims 1, 1, and 21, respectively, and further require: receiving a request to modify one modification restriction for one permitted resource allocation; modifying the modification restriction as requested if the request is submitted by an administrator; and denying the requested modification of the modification restriction if the request is not submitted by the administrator.

The Examiner cited the above discussed paras. [0004], [0007], [0012], [0031], and [0048] as teaching the additional requirements of these claims. (Office Action, pg. 6) Applicants traverse.

The cited paragraphs discuss a permissions list that is used to determine whether an application may access a device resource and that a server database has information on downloaded applications and wireless devices in the network. Nowhere do the cited paragraphs anywhere disclose or discuss requests to modify modification restrictions limiting the ability to modify the permitted resource allocation, or the cited permissions list. Further, although the cited para. [0007] discusses how an administrator or super user may access resources, the cited paragraph nowhere discloses an administrator modifying a modification restriction limiting the ability to modify the permitted resource allocation. In other words, the cited Sprigg does not

disclose the administrator abilities or permissions to modify the cited permissions list restrictions.

Accordingly, claims 8, 17, and 26 are patentable over the cited art because the additional requirements of these claims are not disclosed in the cited Sprigg.

Claims 9, 18, and 27 depend from claims 1, 11, and 21, respectively, and further require that the modification restriction comprises an immutable indicator indicating whether the modification restriction can be modified by someone other than the administrator.

The Examiner cited the above discussed paras. [0004], [0007], [0012], [0031], and [0048] and additional paragraphs [0035] and [0036] as teaching the additional requirements of these claims. (Office Action, pg. 6) Applicants traverse.

As discussed, the previously cited paragraphs discuss a permissions list that is used to determine whether an application may access a device resource and that a server database has information on downloaded applications and wireless devices in the network.

The additional cited para. [0035] mentions that a control program is located on the device to manage access to the resources. The functions of the control program may be incorporated into the operating system of the wireless device or be a separate API. The control program may grant or deny access of a resource to an application based on privileges award to the application. The cited para. [0036] mentions that the privileges are determined via a permission list associated with the application listing resources and an indication of whether the application has permission to access any of the specific device resources. A flag for device resource fields indicates whether an application may access or be denied access to the device resource, such as the microphone or speaker.

Again, the cited paragraphs discuss a permissions list indicating whether an application may access device resources. Nowhere do the cited paragraphs anywhere disclose an immutable indicator indicating whether a modification restriction, concerning whether computational resources indicated in a permitted resource allocation may be modified, can be modified. Nowhere does the cited Sprigg disclose or discuss a flag indicating whether a modification restriction (indicating permitted modifications to the permitted resource allocation) can be modified. Instead, the cited Sprigg concerns flags indicating whether an application may access particular device resources, not a flag indicating whether one may modify modification

restrictions that indicate whether the computational resources indicated in a permitted resource allocation can be modified.

Accordingly, claims 9, 18, and 27 are patentable over the cited art because the additional requirements of these claims are not disclosed in the cited Sprigg.

Claims 10, 19, and 28 depend from claims 1, 11, and 21, respectively, and further require that the modification restriction is maintained in a stored procedure program, and wherein the permitted resource allocations specify resource allocations to execute the stored procedure program in which the modification restrictions are maintained.

The Examiner cited the above discussed paras. [0004], [0007], [0012], [0031], [0035], [0036] and [0048] as teaching the additional requirements of these claims. (Office Action, pg. 6) Applicants traverse.

As discussed, the previously cited paragraphs discuss a permissions list that is used to determine whether an application may access a device resource and that a server database has information on downloaded applications and wireless devices in the network. Further, the cited para. [0035] discusses a control program located on the device to manage access to the resources and grant or deny access of a resource to an application based on privileges awarded to the application. The cited para. [0036] mentions that the privileges are determined via a permission list associated with the application listing resources and an indication of whether the application has permission to access any of the specific device resources. A flag in a device resource fields indicates whether an application may access or be denied access to the device resource, such as the microphone or speaker.

Although the cited paragraphs discuss a control program in a device being used to manage access to the device resources, nowhere does the cited Sprigg disclose a stored procedure or that a modification restriction is maintained in a stored procedure that indicates permitted modifications to a permitted resource allocation. Further, nowhere does the cited Sprigg disclose or discuss resource allocations to execute a stored procedure program in which the modification restrictions are maintained. Instead, the cited Sprigg discusses a permissions list indicating permissible access and that this access is managed by a control program in a device. The Examiner has not cited any part of Sprigg discussing stored procedures as claimed.

Accordingly, claims 10, 19, and 28 are patentable over the cited art because the additional requirements of these claims are not disclosed in the cited Sprigg.

Conclusion

For all the above reasons, Applicant submits that the pending claims 1, 2, and 4-28 are patentable over the art of record. Applicants have not added any claims. Nonetheless, should any additional fees be required, please charge Deposit Account No. 09-0460.

The attorney of record invites the Examiner to contact him at (310) 553-7977 if the Examiner believes such contact would advance the prosecution of the case.

Dated: October 31, 2006   By: /David Victor/

                                                   Registration No. 39,867

Please direct all correspondences to:

David W. Victor
Konrad Raynes & Victor, LLP
315 South Beverly Drive, Ste. 210
Beverly Hills, CA 90212
Tel: (310) 553-7977
Fax: 310-556-7984